

2008 GENERAL SESSION FISCAL NOTE WORKSHEET XI (Revised Jan. 2008)

Agency: UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Bill Number SB 234

TITLE OF BILL: MINIMUM SCHOOL PROGRAM AMENDMENTS--Counseling and Guidance Programs by Senator Mike Dmitrich

Requested by: Ben Leishman

Fax/Electronic Mail Transmittal To:

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst
W310 State Capitol Complex
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5310
538-1034 / Fax 538-1692

Name: Ben Leishman

Date: February 14, 2008

Fax Number: _____

Please return to Fiscal Analyst by: February 14, 2008

This Bill Takes Effect: ☐ On passage ☒ On July 1 ☐ 60 Days after session ☐ Other _____

Bill Carries Own Appropriation: ☒

FISCAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

	FY 2008 Supp.	FY 2009	FY 2010
A. REVENUE IMPACT BY SOURCE OF FUNDS			
1. General Fund			
2. Uniform School Fund - Education Fund			
3. Transportation Fund			
4. Collections			
5. Other Funds (List Below)			
6 Local Funds			
7. TOTAL	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

B. EXPENDITURE IMPACT:

By Source of Funds			
1. General Fund			
2. General Fund, One Time			
3. Uniform School Fund - Education Fund		\$2,315,677,131	\$2,315,677,131
3. Transportation Fund			
4. Collections			
5. Other Funds (List Below) <u>Interest and Dividend Account</u>			
		\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000
6. Local Funds			
7. TOTAL	\$ -	\$ 2,336,677,100	\$ 2,336,677,100
By Expenditure Category			
1. Salaries, Wages and Benefits			
2. Travel			
3. Current Expenses			
4. D.P. Current Expenses			
5. Capital Outlay			
6. D.P. Capital Outlay			
7. Other (Specify) <u>Minimum School Funding</u>		\$2,336,677,131	\$2,315,677,131
8. TOTAL	\$ -	\$ 2,336,677,100	\$ 2,315,677,100

C. IMPACT IN FUTURE YEARS?

If no fiscal impact in the first two years, indicate any impact in future years, and explain. Also, indicate any significant changes in fiscal impact beyond the first two years. (Use back side, or attachment, if necessary.)

Cathy Dudley
Prepared By

MSP Budget and Property Tax Specialist - USOE
Title

Agency

801.538.7667
Phone #

February 14, 2008
Date

D. Identify Sections of the Bill That Will Generate the Additional Workload or Cost Increase**E. Expenditure Impact Details (Ties to totals in Section C)**

List and document methodology and/or assumptions used in determining need for workload and cost increase.

List number, type, and step ranges of personnel required, including benefits.

List details of other impacted expenditure categories as shown in Section C.

List additional space requirements and cost associated with requirements of this bill.

(USE ATTACHMENTS IF NECESSARY.) *The appropriation is to fund the Minimum School Program for the school districts and charter schools. Funding for the comprehensive guidance program is currently being paid from the career and technical education district programs. This bill separates that program, adds a separate line item for comprehensive counseling and guidance programs (\$17,570,346 or 6,989 WPU) and increases the funding for this program.*

F. No Fiscal Impact or Will Not Require Additional Appropriations?

Specify why this bill will have no fiscal impact on your agency or institution.

Specify how you will reallocate workloads, resources, or funding sources to eliminate need for additional appropriations. (USE ATTACHMENTS IF NECESSARY.)

G. If Bill Carries Its Own Appropriation:

Indicate if the amount appropriated is adequate to meet the purposes of the bill.

Are there future additional costs anticipated beyond the appropriation in the bill? *The \$17 million appropriated would be sufficient to meet the purposes of the bill.*

H. Impact on Local Governments, Businesses, Associations, and Individuals

Specify requirements in the bill that drive the impact on local governments.

Indicate costs or savings that are **DIRECT and MEASURABLE**. If direct and measurable data are not available, are there areas that potentially could have a fiscal impact? (USE ATTACHMENT IF NECESSARY.)

Local Governments:

This bill and its appropriation will benefit school districts and charter schools by increasing the money allocated for comprehensive and guidance programs. Over the years, by adding additional approved schools to this program, the fund has been oversubscribed and the districts have had to bear more of the load. It would be beneficial if the matching requirement were deleted as it can be excessively burdensome to some school districts and charter schools.

Businesses and Associations:

Individuals:

This is a draft fiscal note response from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and may be revised in the future.

This fiscal note input draft does not imply endorsement of this bill by the State Board of Education or USOE.